

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

THE TITLE

The title has been amended to more clearly indicate the nature of the invention to which the claims are directed, as required by the Examiner.

THE SPECIFICATION

The Examiner has objected to the specification as not including an abstract. An abstract was submitted with the original application. In addition, an abstract is present in the image file wrapper of the present application. Nevertheless, the abstract has been re-presented above on a separate sheet, as required by the Examiner. The abstract presented above has been revised to put it in better U.S. form.

No new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that the amendment to the specification be approved and entered, and that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

THE CLAIMS

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a display device.
Claim 1 has also been amended to incorporate subject matter based on claim 2, which has been canceled (claim 1 does not explicitly recite a "decision unit" as recited in claim 2). And claim 1 has been amended to make some additional clarifying amendments. See, for example, Figs. 1, 3 and 7 and the corresponding disclosure in the specification.

Claim 3 has been amended to depend from and better accord with amended independent claim 1, as well as to make some additional clarifying amendments. In particular, amended claim 3 recites a communication interface. See, for example, Figs. 1, 3 and 7 and the corresponding disclosure in the specification.

Claim 4 has been amended to make some clarifying amendments. In particular, amended claim 4 recites a storing unit. See, for example, Figs. 1, 3 and 7 and the corresponding disclosure in the specification.

Claim 5 has been amended to incorporate subject matter based on claim 6, which has been canceled, as well as to make some additional clarifying amendments. See, for example, Figs. 4 and 9 and the corresponding disclosure in the specification.

Claim 10 recites a system based on Figs. 1 and 8 and the corresponding disclosure in the specification.

Method claims 11 and 12 are based on claims 4 and 5, respectively. See, for example, Figs. 7 and 9, respectively, and the corresponding disclosure in the specification.

No new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that the amendments to the claims be approved and entered.

Claims 8 and 9, moreover, have been canceled. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the rejection under 35 USC 101 of claims 8 and 9 is moot.

CLAIM FEE

The application was originally filed with 9 claims of which 5 were independent, and the appropriate claim fee was paid for such claims. The application now contains 7 claims, of which 6 are independent. Accordingly, a claim fee in the amount of \$210.00 for the addition of 1 extra independent claim is submitted herewith. In addition, authorization is hereby given to charge any additional fees which may be determined to be required to Account No. 06-1378.

THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

Claims 1 and 4-9 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by US 2005/0103840 ("Boles"), and claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of the

combination of Boles and USP 7,333,001 ("Lane et al"). These rejections, however, are respectfully traversed with respect to the claims set forth above.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a digital camera comprising: an image capture device which captures an image of an article in response to a shutter operation; a display device which displays the image of the article captured by the image capture device; an electronic tag reader which reads, using a wireless transmission, electronic tag information from an electronic tag, which is attached to the article, when the image capture device captures the image of the article; and a writing device which determines whether or not writing of the image of the article captured by the image capture device into the electronic tag is permitted based on the electronic tag information read by the electronic tag reader, and which writes the image of the article captured by the image capture device into the electronic tag when it is determined that the writing of the image is permitted.

The digital camera of claim 1 can capture an image of an article as well as read electronic tag information from an electronic tag which is attached to the article by using a wireless transmission. The electronic tag information can be read from the electronic tag while the image of the article is captured.

It is respectfully submitted that the Boles and Lane et al do not disclose or suggest the structure recited in amended independent claim 1.

As acknowledged by the Examiner on page 6 of the Office Action, Boles does not disclose a decision unit as previously recited in claim 2. For this reason, the Examiner cited Lane et al to supply the missing teachings of Boles.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that Lane et al merely discloses that the controller 4A accesses the security circuit 4F "to authenticate the identity of the reader 10 and to determine if the reader 10 is authorized to request information from, or write information into, or otherwise direct the operation of the RFID tag 2" (column 15, lines 40-47).

Lane et al does not disclose or suggest a writing device which determines whether or not writing of the image of the article captured by the image capture device into the electronic tag is permitted based on the electronic tag information read by the electronic tag reader, and which writes the image of the article captured by the image capture device into the electronic tag when it is determined that the writing of the image is permitted, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that even if Lane et al were combinable with Boles as suggested by the Examiner,

the resultant combination would not achieve or render obvious the structure recited in amended independent claim 1.

Amended independent claim 4 recites a storing unit which stores into a database the image of the article written by the writing device into the electronic tag, in association with the electronic tag information read by the electronic tag reader. In addition, new independent claim 11 recites storing into a database the image data of the article written into the electronic tag in association with the electronic tag information read by the electronic tag reader. With this structure and method, the image data and the electronic tag information can be managed in an efficient manner.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Boles nor Lane et al discloses or suggest this structure and method of amended independent claim 4 and new independent claim 11.

Amended independent claim 5 recites a determining unit which determines whether or not the electronic tag information read by the electronic tag reader includes an image, and a display device which displays the image, when it is determined that the electronic tag information includes the image, and which displays the electronic tag information read by the electronic tag reader when it is determined that the electronic tag information does not include the image. In addition, new independent claim 12 recites determining whether or not the electronic tag information

read by the electronic tag reader includes image data, and displaying the image data on a display device when it is determined that the electronic tag information includes the image data, and displaying the electronic tag information when it is determined that the electronic tag information does not include the image data. With this structure and method, the operator can easily determine which article the read-out information is related to (page 23, lines 6-8 and Fig. 9).

It is respectfully submitted that neither Boles nor Lane et al discloses or suggest this structure and method of amended independent claim 5 and new independent claim 12.

Finally, claim 10 recites that the digital camera comprises a writing unit which writes the image data of the article captured by the digital camera into the electronic tag by the electronic tag reader using a wireless transmission, after the notification indicating that the writing of the image data is permitted is received.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Boles nor Lane et al discloses or suggest this structure of new independent claim 10.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 4 and 5, new independent claims 10-12, and claim 3 depending from claim 1 all clearly

patentably distinguish over Boles and Lane et al, taken singly or in combination, under 35 USC 102 as well as under 35 USC 103.

* * * * *

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue - 16th Floor
New York, New York 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
Fax No. (212) 319-5101

DH:iv/bl
encs.